arXiv:1703.03661v1 [math.CV] 10 Mar 2017

INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION OF MODERATE COHOMOLOGY

HÅKAN SAMUELSSON KALM

Abstract. We generalize and make the classical Dickenstein-Sessa canonical representation of moderate cohomology explicit by providing semi-global Koppelman formulas for certain pseudomeromorphic currents with support in an analytic subset.

1. Introduction

Let M be a complex N-dimensional manifold and $Y \subset M$ an analytic subset. Given a $\bar\partial$-closed (p,q)-current μ on M with support in Y there are in general also local obstructions to finding a current τ with support in Y such that $\mu = \bar\partial\tau$. These obstructions constitute the moderate cohomology sheaf $\mathscr{H}^q_{[Y]}(\Omega^p_M)$, where Ω^p_M is the sheaf of germs of holomorphic p-forms on M. More formally, for an $\mathscr{O}_M$-module $\mathscr{F}$, $\mathscr{H}^0_{[Y]}(\mathscr{F})$ is defined as $\varinjlim \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}_Y^k, \mathscr{F})$, where $\mathcal{J}_Y$ is the radical ideal sheaf defining Y; this defines a left exact functor whose right derived functors are $\mathscr{H}^\bullet_{[Y]}(-) = \varinjlim \mathscr{E}xt^\bullet_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}_Y^k, -)$. Notice that, for any ideal sheaf $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{F})$ is naturally identified with the sheaf of germs of sections of $\mathscr{F}$ annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$. The connection between the formal definition and the informal one is the following isomorphism: Let $\mathscr{C}^{p,q}_M$ be the sheaf of germs of currents on M of bidegree (p,q) and let $\mathscr{C}^{p,q}_Y$ be the subsheaf of germs of currents with support in Y. Then

$$\mathscr{H}^q_{[Y]}(\Omega^p_M) \simeq \mathscr{K}er\left(\bar\partial\colon \mathscr{C}^{p,q}_Y \to \mathscr{C}^{p,q+1}_Y\right) / \mathscr{I}m\left(\bar\partial\colon \mathscr{C}^{p,q-1}_Y \to \mathscr{C}^{p,q}_Y\right), \tag{1.1}$$

cf. [11, Section 6.2]. This isomorphism relies on Malgrange's result that $\mathscr{C}^{p,q}_M$ is a stalk-wise injective $\mathscr{O}_M$-module. In this paper we will use the right-hand side of (1.1) as definition of $\mathscr{H}^q_{[Y]}(\Omega^p_M)$. We notice here the well-known fact that $\mathscr{H}^q_{[Y]}(\Omega^p_M) = 0$ for $q < \operatorname{codim} Y$, see, e.g., [12].

In [16] Dickenstein and Sessa proved that if Y is a locally complete intersection of codimension κ, then the class in $\mathscr{H}^\kappa_{[Y]}(\Omega^p_M)$ of a $\bar\partial$-closed current μ with support in Y has a unique "locally residual current" representative. They extended their results to an arbitrary pure-dimensional Y in [15]. Extracting key properties of the locally residual currents, Björk introduced the sheaf of Coleff-Herrera currents, $\mathscr{CH}_Y$, with support in Y, see, e.g., [11, Section 6.2]; for any analytic subset $Y \subset M$ of pure codimension κ, $\mathscr{CH}^p_Y$ is the sheaf of germs of $\bar\partial$-closed (p,κ)-currents μ with the *standard extension property* (see Section 2.1 below), such that $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_Y\mu = 0$, i.e., such that for any holomorphic function h vanishing on Y, $\bar h\mu = 0$. A non-trivial germ in $\mathscr{CH}^p_Y$ cannot have a $\bar\partial$-potential with support in Y and, in fact, the result of Dickenstein and Sessa can be formulated elegantly as $\mathscr{H}^\kappa_{[Y]}(\Omega^p_M) \simeq \mathscr{CH}^p_Y$. This was

Date: March 13, 2017.
Author partially supported by the Swedish Research Council.

refined by Björk as follows, see, e.g., Björk, *op. cit.*, see also Andersson [1]. Let $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathscr{O}_M$ be a coherent sheaf of ideals of codimension κ, and let Y be the union of the irreducible components of codimension κ of the zero-set of $\mathcal{J}$. Then, locally, if ν is a $\bar\partial$-closed (p,κ)-current with $\mathcal{J}\nu = 0$, there is a unique Coleff-Herrera current μ with $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$ such that $\nu - \mu$ has a $\bar\partial$-potential annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$. In other words, the natural map

$$\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{CH}^p_Y) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathscr{H}^\kappa\big(\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}_M), \bar\partial\big) \tag{1.2}$$

is an isomorphic. Notice that, since $(\mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}_M, \bar\partial)$ is a stalk-wise injective resolution of Ω^p_M, the right-hand side of (1.2) is isomorphic to $\mathscr{E}xt^\kappa_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \Omega^p_M)$.

One objective of this paper is to construct an integral operator $\check{\mathscr{P}}$, which is the identity on Coleff-Herrera currents annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ and such that if μ is any $\bar\partial$-closed (p,κ)-current with $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$, then $\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$ is a Coleff-Herrera current annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ representing the class $[\mu]_{\bar\partial}$, see Definition 3.3 and Proposition 3.8 below. Given a Hermitian free resolution of $\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}$, in [10] is introduced an associated vector-valued current $R = R_\kappa + R_{\kappa+1} + \cdots$, where R_k has bidegree $(0,k)$, such that a holomorphic function h (locally) is a section of $\mathcal{J}$ if and only if $hR = 0$. In [1], Andersson uses the part R_κ of R and shows, given a $\bar\partial$-closed (p,κ)-current μ with $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$, that there is a vector ξ of holomorphic p-forms such that $\xi \cdot R_\kappa$ is a Coleff-Herrera current annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ representing the class $[\mu]_{\bar\partial}$. Given the free resolution of $\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}$, we will construct an integral kernel $p(\zeta, z)$ such that $z \mapsto p(\zeta, z)$ is a smooth compactly supported $(N-p, N-\kappa)$-form, $\zeta \mapsto p(\zeta, z)$ is a vector of holomorphic p-forms, and $\xi = \int_z p(\zeta, z) \wedge \mu(z)$, see Proposition 3.4 below. Our integral operator is then given as

$$\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu = R_\kappa \cdot \int_z p(\zeta, z) \wedge \mu(z).$$

A second objective is to propose a generalization of (1.2). We will describe $\mathscr{H}^q\big(\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}_M), \bar\partial\big)$ for $q \geq \kappa$ as the cohomology of a Dolbeault complex $(\mathscr{B}^{p,\bullet}_{\mathcal{J}}, \bar\partial)$, where $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is a certain fine sheaf of (p,q)-currents supported on the zero-set of $\mathcal{J}$ and which in a sense is as small as possible and without unnecessary singularities. For instance, if $\mathcal{J}$ is the radical ideal sheaf of a smooth submanifold $i\colon Y \hookrightarrow M$ of codimension κ, then $\mathscr{B}^{N,q}_{\mathcal{J}} = i_*\mathscr{E}^{N-\kappa,q-\kappa}_Y$, where $\mathscr{E}^{r,s}_Y$ is the sheaf of germs of smooth (r,s)-forms on Y, see Example 4.2 below.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a complex manifold, let $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathscr{O}_M$ be a coherent sheaf of ideals of codimension κ, and let Y be the union of the irreducible components of codimension κ of the zero-set of $\mathcal{J}$. There are fine sheaves of currents $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$, $q \geq \kappa$, such that*

(a) $\mathcal{J}\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}} = \overline{\sqrt{\mathcal{J}}}\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}} = d\overline{\sqrt{\mathcal{J}}} \wedge \mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}} = 0$;
(b) $\bar\partial\colon \mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}} \to \mathscr{B}^{p,q+1}_{\mathcal{J}}$;
(c) $\mathscr{K}er(\bar\partial\colon \mathscr{B}^{p,\kappa}_{\mathcal{J}} \to \mathscr{B}^{p,\kappa+1}_{\mathcal{J}}) \simeq \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{CH}^p_Y)$;

and the natural map

$$\mathscr{H}^q\big(\mathscr{B}^{p,\bullet}_{\mathcal{J}}, \bar\partial\big) \to \mathscr{H}^q\left(\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}\left(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}_M\right), \bar\partial\right), \quad q \geq \kappa, \tag{1.3}$$

is an isomorphism.

In particular, setting $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}} = 0$ for $q < \kappa$, we have a sheaf complex $(\mathscr{B}^{p,\bullet}_{\mathcal{J}}, \bar\partial)$ whose cohomology sheaves are isomorphic to $\mathscr{E}xt^\bullet_{\mathscr{O}_M}(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \Omega^p_M)$.

The definition of the sheaf $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ relies on certain integral operators $\check{\mathscr{K}}$ associated to $\mathcal{J}$ that we introduce in Section 3, cf. [6], [21], and [22]. In fact, $\oplus_{p,q}\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is defined as the smallest fine sheaf which is closed under such $\check{\mathscr{K}}$-operators and contains all currents of the form $\xi \cdot R$, where ξ is a vector of smooth forms and R is a current associated to a Hermitian free resolution of $\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let M in Theorem 1.1 be (biholomorphic to) a pseudoconvex domain $D \Subset \mathbb{C}^N$ and let $D' \Subset D$. Then there are integral operators $\check{\mathscr{P}}\colon \mathscr{C}^{p,q}(D) \to \mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}(D')$ and $\check{\mathscr{K}}\colon \mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}(D) \to \mathscr{B}^{p,q-1}_{\mathcal{J}}(D')$ for $q \geq \kappa$ such that*

(a) *the inverse of the map* (1.3) *is induced by $\nu \mapsto \check{\mathscr{P}}\nu$;*
(b) *$\check{\mathscr{P}}\bar\partial\tau = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{P}}\tau$ for any $\tau \in \mathscr{C}^{p,q}(D)$ with $\mathcal{J}\tau = 0$;*
(c) *$\mu_{\restriction D'} = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu + \check{\mathscr{K}}\bar\partial\mu + \check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$ for any $\mu \in \mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}(D)$.*

Notice that if $\mu \in \mathscr{B}^{p,\kappa}_{\mathcal{J}}(D)$ is $\bar\partial$-closed, then it follows from (c) that $\mu_{\restriction D'} = \check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$.

Recall now the sheaf $\mathscr{PM}^{p,q}_M$ of germs of *pseudomeromorphic currents* of bidegree (p,q) on M; see Section 2.1 below for details. This sheaf was introduced in [9], and modified to our needs in [6], to give a unified framework for questions about residue currents. Recently, [7], Andersson and Wulcan showed that $\mathscr{PM}^{p,q}_M$ is stalkwise injective and this readily gives the following generalization of (1.2): *The natural map*

$$\mathscr{H}^q\left(\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}\left(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{PM}^{p,\bullet}_M\right), \bar\partial\right) \to \mathscr{H}^q\left(\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}\left(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}_M\right), \bar\partial\right) \tag{1.4}$$

is an isomorphism. By construction, see Section 4 below, our sheaf $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is a subsheaf of $\mathscr{PM}^{p,q}_M$, that, in general, is much smaller and less singular than $\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}\left(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{PM}^{p,q}_M\right)$. For instance, if $\mathcal{J}$ is the radical ideal sheaf corresponding to a smooth submanifold $i\colon Y \hookrightarrow M$ of codimension κ, then, as we have seen, $\mathscr{B}^{N,q}_{\mathcal{J}} = i_*\mathscr{E}^{N-\kappa,q-\kappa}_Y$ whereas $\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_M}\left(\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{PM}^{N,q}_M\right)$ contains the direct image under i of all germs of semimeromorphic $(N-\kappa, q-\kappa)$-currents on Y. We mention also that our operator $\check{\mathscr{K}}$ in fact is defined on all pseudomeromorphic currents and $\operatorname{supp}\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu \subset Y$ for any $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}^{p,q}(D)$. Moreover, if in addition $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$, then (c) of Theorem 1.2 holds.

We conclude this introduction by noticing an application of our results to factorization of analytic cycles. To put it in perspective, we first recall that if f is a holomorphic function and $[Z]$ is the current of integration corresponding to the divisor of f, then, letting $\bar\partial(1/f)$ be the residue current of f in the sense of Herrera-Lieberman [17], the Poincaré-Lelong formula may be written $[Z] = \bar\partial(1/f)\wedge df/(2\pi i)$. If instead $f = (f_1, \dots, f_\kappa)$ is a tuple of holomorphic functions defining a complete intersection, Z is the corresponding cycle, and we construe $\bar\partial(1/f)$ as the Coleff-Herrera product $\bar\partial(1/f_\kappa)\wedge\cdots\wedge\bar\partial(1/f_1)$ and let $df = df_1\wedge\cdots\wedge df_\kappa$, then Coleff and Herrera, [13], showed that $[Z] = \bar\partial(1/f)\wedge df/(2\pi i)^\kappa$. This was globalized to locally complete intersections by Demailly and Passare, [14], and further generalized by Andersson in [4]. Moreover, Lärkäng and Wulcan, [20], recently proved a quite general factorization result for the fundamental cycle corresponding to an arbitrary pure-dimensional analytic subspace. From the results in this paper we get the following result: Let Z be an analytic cycle of pure codimension κ, let $\mathcal{J}$ be an ideal sheaf such that $\mathcal{J}[Z] = 0$, and let R be the residue current associated to a Hermitian free resolution of $\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}$. Then $[Z]$ is a Coleff-Herrera current annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ and so, by Theorem 1.1 (c),

$[Z]$ is a $\bar\partial$-closed section of $\mathscr{B}^{\kappa,\kappa}_{\mathcal{J}}$. Hence, by Theorem 1.2 (c),

$$[Z] = \check{\mathscr{P}}([Z]) = R_\kappa \cdot \int_{z\in Z} p(\zeta, z).$$

Acknowledgment: I would like to thank Mats Andersson and Elizabeth Wulcan for stimulating discussions on the topic of this paper.

2. Pseudomeromorphic currents and weighted integral formulas

2.1. **Pseudomeromorphic currents.** In one complex variable z it is elementary to see that the principal value current $1/z^m$ exists and can be defined, e.g., as the limit as $\epsilon \to 0$ in the sense of currents of $\chi(|h(z)|^2/\epsilon)/z^m$, where h is a non-trivial holomorphic function (or tuple) vanishing at $z = 0$ and χ is a smooth regularization of the characteristic function of $[1,\infty) \subset \mathbb{R}$; for the rest of the paper χ will denote such a function. The current $1/z^m$ can also be defined as the value at $\lambda = 0$ of the analytic continuation of the current-valued function $\lambda \mapsto |h(z)|^{2\lambda}/z^m$. It follows that the *residue current* $\bar\partial(1/z^m)$ can be computed as the limit of $\bar\partial\chi(|h(z)|^2/\epsilon)/z^m$ or as the value at $\lambda = 0$ of $\lambda \mapsto \bar\partial|h(z)|^{2\lambda}/z^m$. Since tensor products of currents are well-defined we can form the current

$$\tau = \bar\partial\frac{1}{z_1^{m_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar\partial\frac{1}{z_r^{m_r}} \wedge \frac{\gamma(z)}{z_{r+1}^{m_{r+1}} \cdots z_M^{m_M}} \tag{2.1}$$

in $\mathbb{C}^M$, where $m_1, \dots, m_r$ are positive integers, $m_{r+1}, \dots, m_M$ are nonnegative integers, and γ is a smooth compactly supported form. Notice that τ is anti-commuting in the residue factors $\bar\partial(1/z_j^{m_j})$ and commuting in the principal value factors $1/z_k^{m_k}$. We say that a current of the form (2.1) is an *elementary pseudomeromorphic current*. By [8, Theorem 2.15], a current μ on a complex manifold X is *pseudomeromorphic* if and only if μ is a locally finite sum of currents of the form $\pi_*\tau$, where τ is of the form (2.1) and π is a holomorphic map from a neighborhood of $\operatorname{supp}\gamma$ to X; a current μ on a reduced pure-dimensional complex space X is pseudomeromorphic if and only if there is a modification $\pi\colon X' \to X$ with X' smooth and a pseudomeromorphic current μ' on X' such that $\mu = \pi_*\mu'$, *op. cit.* This yields the subsheaf $\mathscr{PM}_X$ of the sheaf of germs of currents on any reduced pure-dimensional complex space X. Notice that, since $\bar\partial$ maps an elementary pseudomeromorphic current to a sum of such currents, $\bar\partial$ maps $\mathscr{PM}$ to itself. Moreover, if X and Z are reduced pure-dimensional complex spaces and $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}(X)$, then $\mu \otimes 1 \in \mathscr{PM}(X \times Z)$, see [6, Section 2]. Below, we will omit "$\otimes 1$" and write, e.g., $\mu(x)$ to denote on what variables a current depends.

Dimension principle.([9, Corollary 2.4], [6, Proposition 2.3]) *Let X be a reduced pure-dimensional complex space, let $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}(X)$, and assume that μ has support contained in a subvariety $V \subset X$. If μ has bidegree $(*, q)$ and $\operatorname{codim}_X V > q$, then $\mu = 0$.*

For an analytic subset $Y \subset X$ of pure codimension κ, the sheaf $\mathscr{CH}^p_Y$ is characterized as the subsheaf of $\mathscr{PM}^{p,\kappa}_X$ of germs of $\bar\partial$-closed currents with support in Y, see [2].

Pseudomeromorphic currents can be "restricted" to analytic (or constructible) subsets: Let $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}(X)$, let $V \subset X$ be an analytic subset, and set $V^c := X \setminus V$. Then the restriction of μ to the open subset V^c has a natural pseudomeromorphic extension $\mathbf{1}_{V^c}\mu$ to X. In [9], $\mathbf{1}_{V^c}\mu$ is defined as the value at 0 of the analytic continuation of the current-valued function $\lambda \mapsto |h|^{2\lambda}\mu$, where h is any holomorphic tuple with

zero set V; $\mathbf{1}_{V^c}\mu$ can also be defined as $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\chi(|h|^2v/\epsilon)\mu$, where v is any smooth strictly positive function, see [8, Lemma 2.6], cf. also [19, Lemma 6]. The current $\mathbf{1}_V\mu := \mu - \mathbf{1}_{V^c}\mu$ thus is a pseudomeromorphic current with support contained in V, and if $\operatorname{supp}\mu \subset V$, then $\mathbf{1}_V\mu = \mu$. Moreover, see [8, Section 2.2], if V and W are any constructible subsets then $\mathbf{1}_V\mathbf{1}_W\mu = \mathbf{1}_{V\cap W}\mu$. A current $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}(X)$ has the standard extension property (SEP) with respect to an analytic subsets $V \subset X$ if $\mathbf{1}_W\mu = 0$ for all germs of analytic subsets $W \subset X$ such that $\operatorname{codim}_V W\cap V > 0$.

Recall that a current on X is said to be semi-meromorphic if it a principal value current of the form α/f, where α is a smooth form and f is a holomorphic function or section of a line bundle such that f does not vanish identically on any component of X. Following [6], see also [8, Section 4], we say that a current a on X is *almost semi-meromorphic* if there is a modification $\pi\colon X' \to X$ and a semi-meromorphic current α/f on X' such that $a = \pi_*(\alpha/f)$; if f takes values in $L \to X'$ we need also α to take values in $L \to X'$ if we want a to be scalar valued. If a is almost semi-meromorphic on X, then the smallest Zariski-closed set outside of which a is smooth has positive codimension and is denoted $ZSS(a)$, the *Zariski-singular support* of a, see [8, Section 4].

For proofs of the statements in this paragraph we refer to [8, Section 4], see also [6, Section 2]. Let a be an almost semi-meromorphic current on X and let $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}(X)$. Then there is a unique pseudomeromorphic current T on X coinciding with $a\wedge\mu$ outside of $ZSS(a)$ and such that $\mathbf{1}_{ZSS(a)}T = 0$. If h is a holomorphic tuple, or section of a Hermitian vector bundle, such that $\{h = 0\} = ZSS(a)$, then $T = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\chi(|h|^2/\epsilon)a\wedge\mu$; henceforth we will write $a\wedge\mu$ in place of T. One defines $\bar\partial a\wedge\mu$ so that Leibniz' rule holds, i.e., $\bar\partial a\wedge\mu := \bar\partial(a\wedge\mu) - (-1)^{\deg a}a\wedge\bar\partial\mu$. If μ is almost semi-meromorphic then $a\wedge\mu$ is almost semi-meromorphic and, in fact, $a\wedge\mu = (-1)^{\deg a\deg\mu}\mu\wedge a$.

2.2. **Currents associated to generically exact complexes.** Let M be an N-dimensional complex manifold and let $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathscr{O}_M$ be a coherent sheaf of ideals. Suppose that we have a complex

$$0 \to E_m \xrightarrow{f_m} \cdots \xrightarrow{f_1} E_0 \to 0$$

of holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles, with E_0 being the trivial line bundle, such that the associated sheaf complex $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet), f_\bullet)$ is a resolution of $\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}$. The bundle $E := \oplus_j E_j$ gets a natural superstructure by setting $E^+ := \oplus_j E_{2j}$ and $E^- := \oplus_j E_{2j+1}$. Following [10] we define pseudomeromorphic currents U and R with values in $\operatorname{End}(E)$ associated with the Hermitian complex $(E_\bullet, f_\bullet)$. Notice that $\operatorname{End}(E)$ gets an induced superstructure and so spaces of forms and currents with values in E or $\operatorname{End}(E)$ get superstructures as well. Let $f := \oplus_j f_j$ and set $\nabla := f - \bar\partial$, which then becomes an odd mapping on spaces of forms or currents with values in E such that $\nabla^2 = 0$; notice that ∇ induces an odd mapping ∇_{End} on $\operatorname{End}(E)$-valued forms or currents such that $\nabla^2_{\mathrm{End}} = 0$. Outside of Z, the zero set of $\mathcal{J}$, $(E_\bullet, f_\bullet)$ is pointwise exact and we let $\sigma_k\colon E_{k-1} \to E_k$ be the pointwise minimal inverse of f_k. Set $\sigma := \sigma_1+\sigma_2+\cdots$ and let $u := \sigma+\sigma\bar\partial\sigma+\sigma(\bar\partial\sigma)^2+\cdots$. Notice that $u = \sum_{0\le\ell<k} u_k^\ell$, where $u_k^\ell := \sigma_k\bar\partial\sigma_{k-1}\cdots\bar\partial\sigma_{\ell+1}$ is a smooth $\operatorname{Hom}(E_\ell, E_k)$-valued $(0, k-\ell-1)$-form outside of Z. One can show that $\nabla_{\mathrm{End}}u = \mathrm{Id}_E$. The form u can be exended as a current across Z by setting

$$U := \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\chi(|F|^2/\epsilon)u, \tag{2.2}$$

where F is a (non-trivial) holomorphic tuple vanishing on Z, see, e.g., [10, Section 2]. As with u we will write $U = \sum_{0\le\ell<k} U_\ell^k$, where now U_k^ℓ is a $\mathrm{Hom}(E_\ell, E_k)$-valued $(0, k-\ell-1)$-current; in fact, U is an almost semi-meromorphic current, cf., e.g., [8]. The current R is defined by $\nabla_{\mathrm{End}} U = \mathrm{Id}_E - R$ and hence R is supported on Z and $\nabla_{\mathrm{End}} R = 0$. Notice that R is an almost semi-meromorphic current plus $\bar\partial$ of such a current. One can check that

$$R = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \big(1 - \chi(|F|^2/\epsilon)\big)\mathrm{Id}_E + \bar\partial\chi(|F|^2/\epsilon)\wedge u. \tag{2.3}$$

We write $R = \sum_{0\le\ell<k} R_k^\ell$, where R_k^ℓ is a $\mathrm{Hom}(E_\ell, E_k)$-valued $(0, k-\ell)$-current.

Since the sheaf complex $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet), f_\bullet)$ is supposed to be a resolution of $\mathscr{O}_M/\mathcal{J}$, it follows from [10] that $R = R_\kappa^0 + R_{\kappa+1}^0 + \cdots$, where $\kappa = \operatorname{codim} Z$, and that a holomorphic function g is a section of $\mathcal{J}$ if and only if the E-valued current Rg vanishes.

2.3. **Weighted integral formulas.** We apply Andersson's method, [5], of generating weighted integral formulas in a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$. To begin with, we notice that if $k(\zeta, z)$ is an integrable $(N, N-1)$-form in $D\times D$ and $p(\zeta, z)$ is a smooth (N, N)-form in $D \times D$ such that

$$\bar\partial k(\zeta, z) = [\Delta^D] - p(\zeta, z), \tag{2.4}$$

where $[\Delta^D]$ is the current of integration along the diagonal, then, by applying (2.4) to test forms of the form $\psi(z)\wedge\varphi(\zeta)$, one obtains the integral formula

$$\varphi(z) = \bar\partial_z \int_{D_\zeta} k(\zeta, z)\wedge\varphi(\zeta) + \int_{D_\zeta} k(\zeta, z)\wedge\bar\partial\varphi(\zeta) + \int_{D_\zeta} p(\zeta, z)\wedge\varphi(\zeta) \tag{2.5}$$

for all $z \in D$ and any form φ with compact support in D.

Following [5], let $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)$ be a holomorphic tuple in $D\times D$ that defines the diagonal and let Λ_η be the exterior algebra spanned by $\Lambda^{0,1}T^*(D\times D)$ and the $(1,0)$-forms $d\eta_1, \dots, d\eta_N$. On forms with values in Λ_η interior multiplication with $2\pi i\sum \eta_j\partial/\partial\eta_j$, denoted δ_η, is defined; set $\nabla_\eta = \delta_\eta - \bar\partial$. Let s be a smooth $(1,0)$-form in Λ_η such that $|s| \lesssim |\eta|$ and $|\eta|^2 \lesssim |\delta_\eta s|$ and let $B = \sum_{k=1}^N s\wedge(\bar\partial s)^{k-1}/(\delta_\eta s)^k$. It is proved in [5] that then $\nabla_\eta B = 1 - [\Delta^D]$. Identifying terms of top degree we see that $\bar\partial B_{N,N-1} = [\Delta^D]$ and we have found a solution to (2.4). For instance, if we take $s = \partial|\zeta - z|^2$ and $\eta = \zeta - z$, then the resulting B is sometimes called the full Bochner-Martinelli form and the term of top degree is the classical Bochner-Martinelli kernel.

Let $D_1, D_2 \subset D$. A smooth section $g(\zeta, z) = g_0 + \cdots + g_N$ of Λ_η over $D_1\times D_2$ such that $\nabla_\eta g = 0$ in $D_1\times D_2$ and $g_{0,0}(z,z) = 1$ for $z \in D' := D_1\cap D_2$ is called a *weight* with respect to $D_1\times D_2$; g_j is the sum of the terms of g of bidegree (j,j). Notice that the exterior product of two weights again is a weight (with respect to a suitable set). If g is a weight with respect to $D_1\times D_2$, then it follows that $\nabla_\eta(g\wedge B) = g - g\wedge[\Delta^D]$ in $D_1\times D_2$ and, identifying terms of bidegree $(N, N-1)$, we get that

$$\bar\partial(g\wedge B)_{N,N-1} = g_0[\Delta^D] - g_N \tag{2.6}$$

in $D_1\times D_2$. It follows that if φ is smooth with compact support in D_1, then (2.5), with $k(\zeta, z) = (g(\zeta, z)\wedge B)_{N,N-1}$ and $p(\zeta, z) = g_N(\zeta, z)$, holds in D_2, and vice versa.

Example 2.1. Let $D \Subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be pseudoconvex and let $K \subset D$ be a holomorphically convex compact subset. Let ρ be a smooth compactly supported function in D that is 1 in a neighborhood of K. One can find a smooth form $\tilde s(\zeta, z) = \tilde s_1(\zeta, z)d\eta_1 + \cdots +$

$\tilde{s}_N(\zeta,z)d\eta_N$, defined for z in a neighborhood of $\operatorname{supp}\bar\partial\rho$ and ζ in a neighborhood $\tilde D$ of K, such that $\zeta\mapsto\tilde s(\zeta,z)$ is holomorphic and $\delta_\eta\tilde s=1$. Then

$$g(\zeta,z):=\rho(z)-\bar\partial\rho(z)\wedge\sum_{k=1}^{N}\tilde s\wedge(\bar\partial\tilde s)^{k-1},$$

is a weight with respect to $\tilde D\times D$ that depends holomorphically on ζ and has compact support in D_z; cf. [3, Example 2] or [6, Example 5.1] in case D is the unit ball $\mathbb{B}$ in $\mathbb{C}^N$.

Example 2.2. Let $D\Subset\mathbb{C}^N$ be pseudoconvex, let $\mathcal{J}\subset\mathscr{O}_D$ be a coherent sheaf of ideals in D, and assume that there is a free resolution $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet),f_\bullet)$ of $\mathscr{O}_D/\mathcal{J}$ in D. Let $U=U(\zeta)$ and $R=R(\zeta)$ be associated currents, let U^ϵ and R^ϵ be the regularizations given by (2.2) and (2.3), respectively, and let $U_k^{\epsilon,\ell}$ and $R_k^{\epsilon,\ell}$ be the parts taking values in $\operatorname{Hom}(E_\ell,E_k)$. By [3, Proposition 5.3] we can, for $\ell\le k$, find *Hefer morphisms* H_k^ℓ, which are holomorphic sections of $\Lambda_\eta\otimes\operatorname{Hom}(E^\zeta,E^z)$, such that H_k^ℓ is a holomorphic $k-\ell$-form with values in $\operatorname{Hom}(E_k^\zeta,E_\ell^z)$ and

$$H_k^k\restriction_{\Delta_D}=\operatorname{Id}_{E_k}\quad\text{and}\quad\delta_\eta H_k^\ell=H_{k-1}^\ell f_k-f_{\ell+1}(z)H_k^{\ell+1},\ k>\ell,$$

where $f_k=f_k(\zeta)$. One can check that then

$$G^\epsilon:=\sum_{k\ge0}H_k^0R_k^{\epsilon,0}+f_1(z)\sum_{k\ge1}H_k^1U_k^{\epsilon,0},$$

is a weight with respect to $D\times D$ for all $\epsilon>0$; cf. [3], [10], and [6].

3. Integral operators associated to an ideal sheaf

Let $D\Subset\mathbb{C}^N$ be pseudoconvex, let $\mathcal{J}\subset\mathscr{O}_D$ be a coherent sheaf of ideals in D, and let $D'\Subset D$. Let $g(\zeta,z)$ be any weight with respect to $D'\times D$ such that $z\mapsto g(\zeta,z)$ has compact support in some $D''\Subset D$ for all ζ. In D'' there is a free resolution $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet),f_\bullet)$ of $\mathscr{O}_D/\mathcal{J}$, associated currents $U=U(\zeta)$ and $R=R(\zeta)$, and, moreover, in $D''\times D''$ we can find associated Hefer morphisms H_k^ℓ. Then $G^\epsilon=HR^\epsilon+f_1(z)HU^\epsilon$ of Example 2.2 is a weight with respect to $D''\times D''$. It follows that $G^\epsilon\wedge g$ is a weight with respect to $D'\times D$ and has compact support in D_z.

Notice, in view of Example 2.1, that we may choose the weight g so that $\zeta\mapsto g(\zeta,z)$ is holomorphic and does not contain any $d\bar\zeta$-differentials.

Lemma 3.1. *If φ is a test form in D', then, for all $\epsilon>0$ and all $z\in D$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(z)\ &=\ \bar\partial_z\int_\zeta(HR^\epsilon\wedge g\wedge B)_{N,N-1}\wedge\varphi(\zeta)+\int_\zeta(HR^\epsilon\wedge g\wedge B)_{N,N-1}\wedge\bar\partial\varphi(\zeta)\\&\quad+\int_\zeta(HR^\epsilon\wedge g)_{N,N}\wedge\varphi(\zeta)+\mathcal{J}\psi,\end{aligned}$$

where ψ is some test form in D, and the integrals on the right-hand side are test forms in D.

Proof. Since $G^\epsilon\wedge g=HR^\epsilon\wedge g+f_1(z)HU^\epsilon\wedge g$ is a weight with respect to $D'\times D$ and the entries of f_1 are sections of $\mathcal{J}$, it follows from Section 2.3 that the claimed equality holds in D. Since $z\mapsto g(\zeta,z)$ has compact support in D, ψ as well as the integrals on the right-hand side are test forms in D. □

Let μ be an arbitrary current in D. Since z and $\zeta - z$ are independent variables in $D \times D$, the tensor product $B \wedge \mu(z)$ is well-defined, cf. [18, Theorem 5.1.1]. Let $\pi\colon D_\zeta \times D_z \to D_\zeta$ be the natural projection. Then, since $z \mapsto g(\zeta, z)$ has compact support,

$$\pi_* \left(HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B\right)_{N,N-1} \wedge \mu(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_* \left(HR^\epsilon \wedge g\right)_{N,N} \wedge \mu(z)$$

are well-defined current in D'_ζ. For notational convenience we will often write $\int_z \tau$ instead of $\pi_*\tau$ for currents τ in $D \times D$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let μ be a current in D such that $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$. Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\zeta) \;\; &= \;\; \int_z (HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \bar\partial\mu(z) + \bar\partial_\zeta \int_z (HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \mu(z) \\ &\quad + \int_z (HR^\epsilon \wedge g)_{N,N} \wedge \mu(z) \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

holds in D'.

Proof. Let φ be a test form in D'. The action of the current $\int_z (HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \bar\partial\mu(z)$ on $\varphi(\zeta)$ is by definition the action of $(HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \bar\partial\mu(z)$ on $\varphi(\zeta) \otimes 1$ and this equals, by [18, Theorem 5.1.1.], the action of $\bar\partial\mu(z)$ on $\int_\zeta (HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \varphi(\zeta)$. Hence,

$$\left(\int_z (HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \bar\partial\mu(z) \right) . \varphi(\zeta) = \pm\mu(z) . \left(\bar\partial_z \int_\zeta (HR^\epsilon \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \varphi(\zeta) \right).$$

Similar formulas hold for the second and third term on the right-hand side of (3.1) and the lemma thus follows from Lemma 3.1. □

Definition 3.3. For a current μ in D we let $\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$ be the current in D' given by

$$\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu(\zeta) = \int_z (HR \wedge g)_{N,N} \wedge \mu(z).$$

Notice, since $R = R(\zeta)$, that $(HR \wedge g)_{N,N} \wedge \mu(z)$ is well-defined as a tensor product in $D' \times D$. Notice also that $\check{\mathscr{P}}$ maps arbitrary currents in D to pseudomeromorphic currents in D' annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$.

The operator $\check{\mathscr{P}}$ of Theorem 1.2 corresponds to a choice of weight g such that $\zeta \mapsto g(\zeta, z)$ is holomorphic, but in the definition above we do not require this.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose that the weight g in the definition of $\check{\mathscr{P}}$ depends holomorphically on ζ. Then, for any (p,q)-current μ in D, $\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$ is of the form $\xi \cdot R^0_q$, where*

$$\xi = \Phi(\mu) = \int_z H^0_q \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z)$$

is a holomorphic p-form with values in E^*_q. Moreover, if $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$ then $\check{\mathscr{P}}\bar\partial\mu = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$ and $\Phi(\bar\partial\mu) = f^*_{q+1}\Phi(\mu)$, where f^*_{q+1} is the transpose of the map $f_{q+1}\colon E_{q+1} \to E_q$.

For the rest of this section we will fix frames for the trivial E_j-bundles and associated dual frames for the E^*_j's; sections of the E_j's will be represented by column vectors, sections of the E^*_j's by row vectors, and maps between bundles by matrices. Notice that E_0 is assumed to be the trivial line bundle so that $\mathrm{Hom}(E_j, E_0) \simeq E^*_j$. Recall that $f_k = f_k(\zeta)$. To prove Proposition 3.4 we will need

Lemma 3.5. *Letting $(\cdot)^*$ denote matrix transpose we have*

$$f_{q+1}^*(H_q^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q} = \bar\partial\big((H_{q+1}^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q-1}\big) + (f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1)^* \wedge g_{N-q}.$$

Proof. This is verified by the following computation.

$$\begin{aligned} f_{q+1}^*(H_q^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q} &= (H_q^0 f_{q+1})^* \wedge g_{N-q} \\ &= (\delta_\eta H_{q+1}^0 + f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \\ &= (\delta_\eta H_{q+1}^0 \wedge g_{N-q})^* + (f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \\ &= (\pm H_{q+1}^0 \wedge \delta_\eta g_{N-q})^* + (f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \\ &= (\pm H_{q+1}^0 \wedge \bar\partial g_{N-q-1})^* + (f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \\ &= \bar\partial(H_{q+1}^0 \wedge g_{N-q-1})^* + (f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1)^* \wedge g_{N-q}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the properties of the Hefer morphisms (see Example 2.2), the forth since $0 = \delta_\eta(H_{q+1}^0 \wedge g_{N-q})$ for degree reasons, the fifth since g is a weight, and the sixth since H_{q+1}^0 is holomorphic. □

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Since g is holomorphic in ζ and in particular contains no $d\bar\zeta$-differentials, it follows for degree reasons that

$$\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu(\zeta) = \int_z H_q^0 R_q^0 \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z) = \pm(R_q^0)^* \int_z (H_q^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z).$$

Since also H is holomorphic in ζ the first statement of the proposition follows. For the rest of this proof we will for convenience write R_j instead of R_j^0.

Assume that $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$. To see that $\check{\mathscr{P}}\bar\partial\mu = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$ we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathscr{P}}\bar\partial\mu &= \int_z H_{q+1}^0 R_{q+1} \wedge g_{N-q-1} \wedge \bar\partial\mu(z) \\ &= \pm R_{q+1}^* \int_z \bar\partial\big((H_{q+1}^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q-1}\big) \wedge \mu(z) \\ &= \pm R_{q+1}^* \int_z f_{q+1}^*(H_q^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z) \mp R_{q+1}^* \int_z (f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z) \\ &= \pm(f_{q+1}R_{q+1})^* \int_z (H_q^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z) \\ &= \bar\partial\left(R_q^* \int_z (H_q^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z)\right) = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds since $R = R(\zeta)$ is independent of z, the third by Lemma 3.5, the forth since (the entries of) $f_1(z)$ annihilate $\mu(z)$, and the fifth since $\nabla_{\mathrm{End}}R = 0$ (see Section 2.2) and H and g are holomorphic in ζ.

Moreover, in view of Lemma 3.5, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\bar\partial\mu)^* &= \int_z \bar\partial\big((H_{q+1}^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q-1}\big) \wedge \mu(z) \\ &= f_{q+1}^* \int_z (H_q^0)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z) + \int_z \big(f_1(z)H_{q+1}^1\big)^* \wedge g_{N-q} \wedge \mu(z) \\ &= f_{q+1}^*\Phi(\mu)^* \end{aligned}$$

since (the entries of) $f_1(z)$ annihilate $\mu(z)$. □

Let $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}(D)$. Since B is almost semi-meromorphic in $D \times D$, the product $B \wedge \mu(z)$ is a well-defined pseudomeromorphic current in $D \times D$, in view of Section 2.1; by the uniqueness in [18, Theorem 5.1.1.], $B \wedge \mu(z)$ coincides with the tensor product of B and μ (z and $\zeta - z$ are independent variables). Since R is an almost semi-meromorphic current plus $\bar\partial$ of such a current, cf. Section 2.2, $R \wedge B \wedge \mu(z)$ is a well-defined pseudomeromorphic current in $D' \times D$ that can be defined as $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} R^\epsilon \wedge B \wedge \mu(z)$, cf. (2.3) and Section 2.1. Notice that even though $R^0_j = 0$ for $j < \kappa$, where κ is the codimension of the zero-set Z of $\mathcal{J}$, it might happen that $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} R^{0,\epsilon}_j \wedge B \wedge \mu(z) \neq 0$. Still, the support of $R \wedge B \wedge \mu(z)$ is contained in $Z \times \operatorname{supp}\mu$. To see this it suffices, in view of (2.3) and Section 2.1, to see that $\mathbf{1}_{Z\times D} B \wedge \mu(z) = 0$. Since B is smooth outside of the diagonal $\Delta \subset D \times D$ it is clear that $\operatorname{supp} \mathbf{1}_{Z\times D} B \wedge \mu(z) \subset \Delta$. Moreover, $ZSS(B) \subset \Delta$ and so $\mathbf{1}_\Delta B \wedge \mu(z) = 0$. Hence,

$$\mathbf{1}_{Z\times D} B \wedge \mu(z) = \mathbf{1}_\Delta \mathbf{1}_{Z\times D} B \wedge \mu(z) = \mathbf{1}_{Z\times D} \mathbf{1}_\Delta B \wedge \mu(z) = 0.$$

Definition 3.6. For a pseudomeromorphic current μ in D we let $\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu$ be the pseudomeromorphic current in D' given by

$$\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu(\zeta) = \int_z (HR \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \mu(z).$$

As in the definition of the $\check{\mathscr{P}}$-operators, we do not require g to be holomorphic in ζ, but the $\check{\mathscr{K}}$-operator of Theorem 1.2 corresponds to such a choice.

Notice that, since $\operatorname{supp} R \wedge B \wedge \mu(z) \subset Z \times D$, $\check{\mathscr{K}}$ maps pseudomeromorphic currents in D to pseudomeromorphic currents in D' with support contained in Z. We do not know whether or not $\mathcal{J}\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu = 0$.

The following proposition follows from Lemma 3.2 by letting $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proposition 3.7. *For any $\mu \in \mathscr{PM}^{p,q}(D)$ such that $\mathcal{J}\mu = 0$ we have $\mu_{\restriction D'} = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu + \check{\mathscr{K}}\bar\partial\mu + \check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$.*

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\check{\mathscr{P}}$ be an operator associated to $\mathcal{J}$ and corresponding to a weight g such that $\zeta \mapsto g(\zeta, z)$ is holomorphic. Let κ be the codimension of $\mathcal{J}$ and let Y be the union of the irreducible components of the zero-set Z of $\mathcal{J}$ of codimension κ. If μ is a Coleff-Herrera current in D of bidegree (p,κ), annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$, then $\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu = \mu_{\restriction D'}$. Moreover, if ν is any $\bar\partial$-closed (p,κ)-current in D annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$, then $\check{\mathscr{P}}\nu$ is a section of $\mathscr{CH}^p_Y$ annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ and there is a current τ annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ such that $\nu - \check{\mathscr{P}}\nu = \bar\partial\tau$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.7, $\mu_{\restriction D'} = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu + \check{\mathscr{P}}\mu$. However, $\check{\mathscr{K}}\tilde\mu$ is a pseudomeromorphic $(p,\kappa-1)$-current with support contained in Z and must thus vanish in view of the Dimension principle.

For the second statement, we notice that, in view of (1.2), there is a Coleff-Herrera current μ annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ and a current τ' annihilated by $\mathcal{J}$ such that $\mu = \nu + \bar\partial\tau'$. Hence, by the first part of the proof and Proposition 3.4,

$$\mu = \check{\mathscr{P}}\mu = \check{\mathscr{P}}\nu + \check{\mathscr{P}}\bar\partial\tau' = \check{\mathscr{P}}\nu + \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{P}}\tau'.$$

Thus, $\nu - \check{\mathscr{P}}\nu = \bar\partial(\check{\mathscr{P}}\tau' - \tau')$, and it remains to see that $\check{\mathscr{P}}\nu$ is a section of $\mathscr{CH}^p_Y$. However, $\check{\mathscr{P}}\nu$ is a pseudomeromorphic (p,κ)-current, which clearly is $\bar\partial$-closed and has support in Z. In view of the Dimension principle it then must have support in Y, and so is a section of $\mathscr{CH}^p_Y$. □

4. The sheaf $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ and proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

Let M be an N-dimensional complex manifold and $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathscr{O}_M$ a coherent sheaf of ideals. In analogy with [6, Definition 7.1], [21, Definition 4.1], and [22, Section 6.2] we make the following definition.

Definition 4.1. A (p,q)-current μ on M is a section of $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ over an open set $\mathcal{U} \subset M$ if for each $x \in \mathcal{U}$ there is a neighborhood of x biholomorphic to a pseudoconvex domain $D \Subset \mathbb{C}^N$ such that $\mu_{|D}$ is a finite sum of currents of the form

$$\xi_m \wedge \check{\mathscr{K}}_m(\cdots \xi_1 \wedge \check{\mathscr{K}}_1(\xi_0 \cdot R)\cdots), \tag{4.1}$$

where R is a current corresponding to a Hermitian free resolution $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet), f_\bullet)$ of $\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}$ in D, ξ_0 is a smooth form with values in $\oplus_q E_q^*$, ξ_j is a smooth form for $j \geq 1$, and the $\check{\mathscr{K}}_j$'s are operators as in Definition 3.6.

It is clear from the definition that $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}} := \oplus_{p,q}\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is a module over the sheaf of germs of smooth forms and that it is closed under $\check{\mathscr{K}}$-operator. Notice also, in view of Section 3, that a $\check{\mathscr{P}}$-operator maps an arbitrary current to a section of $\mathscr{B}_J$ and that $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is a subsheaf of $\mathscr{PM}^{p,q}$.

Example 4.2. Suppose that $\mathcal{J}$ is the radical ideal sheaf of a complex submanifold $i\colon Y \hookrightarrow M$ of codimension κ. Then $\mathscr{B}^{N,q}_{\mathcal{J}} = i_*\mathscr{E}^{N-\kappa,q-\kappa}_Y$. This may be verified locally and so we assume that M is the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^N$ with coordinates $(z;w)$ such that $Y = \{z = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \langle z\rangle$. For notational convenience we will also assume that $\kappa = 1$. Let φ be a smooth $(N-1,q-1)$-form on Y and let $\tilde{\varphi}$ be any smooth extension of φ to M. Then $i_*\varphi = \tilde{\varphi} \wedge [Y]$. From the free resolution $0 \to \mathscr{O} \xrightarrow{z\cdot} \mathscr{O}$ of $\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}$ we get the current $R = \bar{\partial}(1/z)$ and so, by the Poincaré-Lelong formula, $\tilde{\varphi} \wedge [Y] = i\tilde{\varphi} \wedge dz \wedge R/2\pi$. Hence, $i_*\mathscr{E}^{N-\kappa,q-\kappa}_Y \subset \mathscr{B}^{N,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$.

For the opposite inclusion, let μ be a section of $\mathscr{B}^{N,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$; we may assume that μ is of the form (4.1). We use induction over m in (4.1) to see that $\mu = \xi \wedge [Y]$ for some smooth ξ; notice that such a ξ exists if there is a continuous ξ', which is smooth along Y, such that $\mu = \xi' \wedge [Y]$. If $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet), f_\bullet)$ is any free Hermitian resolution of $\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}$ with $\operatorname{rank} E_0 = 1$, then the associated residue current is of the form $\alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}(1/z)$, where α is a smooth $(0,*)$-form with values in $\oplus_j E_j$, see [10, Theorem 4.4]. Hence, if μ is of the form (4.1) with $m = 0$, then $\mu = \xi_0 \cdot \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}(1/z)$, where ξ_0 is a smooth $(N,*)$-form with values in $\oplus_j E_j^*$. Writing $\xi_0 \cdot \alpha = \xi \wedge dz$, for some scalar-valued smooth form ξ, we get $\xi_0 \cdot \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}(1/z) = -2\pi i\xi \wedge [Y]$, and the induction start follows. Now, if $\check{\mathscr{K}}$ is an integral operator as in Definition 3.6, then

$$\check{\mathscr{K}}(\xi \wedge [Y]) = \int_{z\in Y} (HR \wedge g \wedge B)_{N,N-1} \wedge \xi(z) = R \cdot \int_{z\in Y} k(\zeta,z) \wedge \xi(z),$$

where $R = R(\zeta)$ is of the form $\alpha(\zeta) \wedge \bar{\partial}(1/\zeta)$ as above, and $k(\zeta,z)$ is a kernel in $M \times M$ which is $\mathcal{O}(1/|\zeta - z|^{2(N-1)-1})$. It follows that $\zeta \mapsto \int_{z\in Y} k(\zeta,z) \wedge \xi(z)$ is a continuous $(N,*)$-form with values in $\oplus_j E_j^*$ and we write it as $\psi(\zeta) \wedge d\zeta$. Moreover, in view of [6, Lemma 6.2], $\psi_{|Y}$ is smooth. We get

$$\check{\mathscr{K}}(\xi \wedge [Y]) = \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}(1/\zeta) \cdot \psi \wedge d\zeta = \pm 2\pi i\alpha \cdot \psi \wedge [Y],$$

and the induction step follows. □

To prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 we may assume that $M = D \Subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is a pseudoconvex domain. Let $D' \Subset D$ and let $D'' \Subset D$ be a suitable neighborhood of $\overline{D'}$ as in the beginning of Section 3. Let $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet), f_\bullet)$ be a Hermitian free resolution of $\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}$ in D'', and let U and R be the associated currents. The cohomology sheaves of the complex $\big(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet^*) \otimes \Omega^p, f_\bullet^* \otimes \mathrm{Id}\big)$, where Ω^p is the sheaf of germs of holomorphic p-forms in D, are then isomorphic to $\mathscr{E}\!\mathit{xt}^\bullet(\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}, \Omega^p)$, and, moreover, naturally isomorphic to the cohomology sheaves of the complex $\big(\mathscr{H}\!\mathit{om}_{\mathscr{O}}(\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}), \bar\partial\big)$ since $\mathscr{C}^{p,q}$ is stalk-wise injective. For convenience we will write just f_k^* instead of $f_k^* \otimes \mathrm{Id}$. Following [1] we notice that if ξ is a holomorphic p-form with values in E_q^* such that $f_{q+1}^*\xi = 0$, then, since $\nabla_{\mathrm{End}} R = 0$,

$$\bar\partial(\xi \cdot R_q) = \pm\xi \cdot \bar\partial R_q = \pm\xi \cdot f_{q+1}R_{q+1} = \pm f_{q+1}^*\xi \cdot R_{q+1} = 0.$$

Similarly, if $\xi = f_q^*\xi'$, then $\xi \cdot R_q = 0$. Hence, we have a map Ψ from the cohomology of $\big(\mathscr{H}\!\mathit{om}_{\mathscr{O}}(\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}), \bar\partial\big)$ to the cohomology of $(\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,\bullet}, \bar\partial)$ induced by $\xi \mapsto \xi \cdot R$. Moreover, cf. [1, Section 7], we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{H}^q\big(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet^*) \otimes \Omega^p,\, f_\bullet^*\big) & \xrightarrow{\quad\Psi\quad} & \mathscr{H}^q\left(\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,\bullet},\, \bar\partial\right) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & \mathscr{H}^q\left(\mathscr{H}\!\mathit{om}_{\mathscr{O}}\left(\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}, \mathscr{C}^{p,\bullet}\right),\, \bar\partial\right), \end{array} \tag{4.2}$$

where the diagonal map is the natural isomorphism, showing that Ψ is injective and that the vertical map is surjective.

Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. We have already noticed that any $\check{\mathscr{P}}$-operator maps arbitrary currents to sections of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ and that any $\check{\mathscr{K}}$-operator maps sections of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ to sections of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$. Moreover, part (b) of Theorem 1.2 follows from Proposition 3.4.

Let us now temporarily assume that $\mathcal{J}\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,q} = 0$ and show how the remaining parts of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 follow. Part (c) of Theorem 1.2 then follows from Proposition 3.7. Moreover, the sections of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,q}$ are then pseudomeromorphic currents with support in the zero-set of $\mathcal{J}$, and so, by [9, Proposition 2.3], $\overline{\sqrt{\mathcal{J}}}\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,q} = d\overline{\sqrt{\mathcal{J}}} \wedge \mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,q} = 0$. If μ is a $\bar\partial$-closed section of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,\kappa}$, then $\operatorname{supp}\mu \subset Y$, by the Dimension principle, and so μ is a section of $\mathscr{CH}_Y^p$. Thus, part (c) of Theorem 1.1 follows. To show part (b) of Theorem 1.1, it suffices to show that if μ is of the form (4.1) with $\xi_m = 1$, then $\bar\partial\mu$ is a section of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$; we will use induction over m to see this. The case $m = 0$ follows since $\nabla_{\mathrm{End}} R = 0$, indeed

$$\bar\partial(\xi \cdot R) = \bar\partial\xi \cdot R \pm \xi \cdot \bar\partial R = \bar\partial\xi \cdot R \pm \xi \cdot fR = \bar\partial\xi \cdot R \pm f^*\xi \cdot R.$$

If $m > 0$, then we write $\mu = \check{\mathscr{K}}_m\mu'$, where μ' is of the form (4.1) with m replaced by $m-1$. By Proposition 3.7 we get

$$\bar\partial\mu = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}_m\mu' = \mu' - \check{\mathscr{K}}_m\bar\partial\mu' - \check{\mathscr{P}}_m\mu',$$

and since $\bar\partial\mu'$ is a section of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ by the induction hypothesis, it follows that $\bar\partial\mu$ is a section of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$. To show that the map (1.3) is an isomorphism, it remains, in view of the paragraph preceding this proof, to see that it is injective. Let μ be a $\bar\partial$-closed section of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}^{p,q}$ and suppose that there is a current τ with $\mathcal{J}\tau = 0$ such that $\mu = \bar\partial\tau$. By parts (c) and (b) of Theorem 1.2 we have

$$\mu = \bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu + \check{\mathscr{P}}\mu = \bar\partial(\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu + \check{\mathscr{P}}\tau),$$

showing that the section of $\mathscr{H}^q(\mathscr{B}^{p,\kappa}_{\mathcal{J}},\bar\partial)$ defined by μ is 0. Showing part (a) of Theorem 1.2 is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.8; indeed, let ν be a $\bar\partial$-closed current such that $\mathcal{J}\nu=0$. Since (4.1) is an isomorphism there is a $\bar\partial$-closed section μ of $\mathscr{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ and a current τ with $\mathcal{J}\tau=0$ such that $\mu=\nu+\bar\partial\tau$. By parts (c) and (b) of Theorem 1.2 we have

$$\nu+\bar\partial\tau=\mu=\bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu+\check{\mathscr{P}}\mu=\bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu+\check{\mathscr{P}}\nu+\bar\partial\check{\mathscr{P}}\tau,$$

and so $\nu-\check{\mathscr{P}}\nu=\bar\partial(\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu+\check{\mathscr{P}}\tau-\tau)$.

To conclude Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 it remains to show that $\mathcal{J}\mu=0$ for any section μ of $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$; we may assume that μ is of the form (4.1). In view of Section 2.1, the product

$$T_{m,q}:=R_{k_m}(z_m)\wedge B_{\ell_m}(z_m,z_{m-1})\wedge\cdots\wedge B_{\ell_1}(z_1,z_0)\wedge R_q(z_0),\quad k_j+\ell_j\le N,$$

is a well-defined pseudomeromorphic current in $D_{z_0}\times\cdots\times D_{z_m}$; here the R's are currents corresponding to Hermitian resolutions of $\mathscr{O}/\mathcal{J}$ and the B's are Bochner-Martinelli type forms as in Section 2.3; R_{k_j} is a component of the part of the j^{th} R-current of bidegree $(0,k_j)$ and B_{ℓ_j} is the part of the j^{th} Bochner-Martinelli type form of bidegree (ℓ_j,ℓ_j-1). In view of Definition 3.6, μ is a sum of push-forwards, under maps $D_{z_0}\times\cdots\times D_{z_m}\to D_{z_m}$, of $T_{m,q}$-currents times smooth forms, and therefore it is sufficient to show that $\mathcal{J}T_{m,q}=0$ where $\mathcal{J}=\mathcal{J}(z_m)$; we will do this by double induction over m and q. Since $T_{0,q}=R_q$ it is clear that $\mathcal{J}T_{0,q}=0$ for all q. Fix now $m>0$ and notice that $T_{m,q}$ has bidegree $(\sum_{j=1}^m\ell_j,\sum_{j=1}^m k_j+\ell_j-m+q)$ and that $\sum_{j=1}^m k_j+\ell_j-m+q\le mN-m+q$. From the paragraph preceding Definition 3.6 it follows that the support of $T_{m,q}$ is contained in $Z\times\cdots\times Z$ ($m+1$ copies), where Z is the zero-set of $\mathcal{J}$. Moreover, if $z_{s+1}\neq z_s$ for some $0\le s\le m-1$, then $B_{\ell_{s+1}}(z_{s+1},z_s)$ is smooth and so $T_{m,q}$ is a smooth form times the tensor product of two currents $T_{s,q}$ and $T_{m-s-1,k_{s+1}}$. By induction over m we have $\mathcal{J}T_{m-s-1,k_{s+1}}=0$. It follows that the support of $\mathcal{J}T_{m,q}$ is contained in $\{z_0=\cdots=z_m\}\cap Z\times\cdots\times Z\simeq Z$, which has codimension $mN+\kappa$ in $D_{z_0}\times\cdots\times D_{z_m}$. Thus, by the Dimension Principle, $\mathcal{J}T_{m,q}=0$ if $mN-m+q<mN+\kappa$, i.e., if $q<\kappa+m$. In particular, $\mathcal{J}T_{m,\kappa}=0$, which is the induction start for showing $\mathcal{J}T_{m,q}=0$ by induction over q. Let $R=R(z_0)=R_\kappa(z_0)+R_{\kappa+1}(z_0)+\cdots$ be the R-current associated to the Hermitian free resolution $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet),f_\bullet)$ as in Section 2.2. From (the proof of) [10, Theorem 4.4] it follows that outside of the set Z_k, where f_k does not have optimal rank, there is a smooth $\operatorname{Hom}(E_k,E_{k+1})$-valued $(0,1)$-form $\alpha_k=\alpha_k(z_0)$ such that $R_k=\alpha_kR_{k-1}$. Moreover, since $(\mathscr{O}(E_\bullet),f_\bullet)$ is exact, it follows from the Buchsbaum-Eisenbud criterion that $\operatorname{codim}Z_k\ge k$, $k\ge1$. Hence, for $z_0\notin Z_{\kappa+1}$ we have $T_{m,\kappa+1}=\alpha_{\kappa+1}T_{m,\kappa}$ and so the support of $\mathcal{J}T_{m,\kappa+1}$ must be contained in the set where $z_0\in Z_{\kappa+1}$. Since it also has support contained in $\{z_0=\cdots=z_m\}$ it must in fact have support contained in $\{z_0=\cdots=z_m\}\cap Z_{\kappa+1}\times\cdots\times Z_{\kappa+1}\simeq Z_{\kappa+1}$, which has codimension $\ge mN+\kappa+1$ in $D_{z_0}\times\cdots\times D_{z_m}$. By the Dimension principle, then, $\mathcal{J}T_{m,\kappa+1}=0$. Continuing in this way get that $\mathcal{J}T_{m,q}=0$ for all q. □

In particular it follows that the map Ψ of (4.2) is an isomorphism. The injectivity relied on Malgrange's result that $\mathscr{C}^{p,q}$ is stalk-wise injective, but both surjectivity and injectivity can be showed directly using the methods of this paper. To conclude we sketch how this can be done. For the surjectivity of Ψ, let μ be a $\bar\partial$-closed section of $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$. Then, by Propositions 3.7 and 3.4, $\mu=\xi\cdot R^0_q+\bar\partial\check{\mathscr{K}}\mu$, where $f^*_{q+1}\xi=0$, and so the germ of a section of $\mathscr{H}^q(\mathscr{B}^{p,\bullet}_{\mathcal{J}},\bar\partial)$ defined by μ is in the image of Ψ.

For the injectivity we will use a new kind of weight in our integral formulas to see that the map Φ, defined in Proposition 3.4, induces a left inverse of Ψ. Notice that Φ indeed induces a map on cohomology since $\Phi(\bar\partial\mu) = f_{q+1}^*\Phi(\mu)$ for sections μ of $\mathscr{B}^{p,q}_{\mathcal{J}}$. With the setup of Example 2.2, consider

$$\begin{aligned}\check G_q^\epsilon &:= \sum_{\ell=0}^{q} R_q^{\ell,\epsilon}(z)H_q^\ell + \sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1} U_q^{\ell,\epsilon}(z)H_{q-1}^\ell f_q + \sum_{\ell=0}^{q} f_{q+1}(z)U_{q+1}^{\ell,\epsilon}(z)H_q^\ell \\ &=: R_q^\epsilon(z)H_q + U_q^\epsilon(z)H_{q-1}f_q + f_{q+1}(z)U_{q+1}^\epsilon(z)H_q,\end{aligned}$$

which is a smooth section of $\Lambda_\eta \otimes \mathrm{Hom}(E_q^\zeta, E_q^z)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$; notice that $U^\epsilon(z)$ and $R^\epsilon(z)$ here depend on z. One can check that $\check G_q^\epsilon$ satisfies the properties of being a weight, with the property $\check G_{q,0}^\epsilon(z,z) = 1$ construed as $\check G_{q,0}^\epsilon(z,z) = \mathrm{Id}_{E_q}$. Let also $g = g(\zeta, z)$ be a suitable weight such that $\zeta \mapsto g(\zeta, z)$ is holomorphic and $z \mapsto g(\zeta, z)$ has compact support, cf. Example 2.1. Identifying sections of the E_j^*'s with row vectors, sections of the E_j's with column vectors, mappings with matrices, and letting $(\cdot)^*$ denote matrix transpose as in Section 3, we get for any E_q^*-valued holomorphic p-form ξ, in view of Section 2.3, that

$$\begin{aligned}\xi^*(\zeta) &= \int_z \big(\check G^\epsilon \wedge g\big)^*_{N,N} \wedge \xi^*(z) = \int_z \big(R_q^\epsilon(z)H_q \wedge g\big)^*_{N,N} \wedge \xi^*(z) \\ &+ \int_z \big(U_q^\epsilon(z)H_{q-1}f_q \wedge g\big)^*_{N,N} \wedge \xi^*(z) + \int_z \big(f_{q+1}(z)U_{q+1}^\epsilon(z)H_q \wedge g\big)^*_{N,N} \wedge \xi^*(z).\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the last integral vanishes if $f_{q+1}^*\xi^* = 0$, and that the second last integral is f_q^*-exact. Since $R = R_\kappa^0 + R_{\kappa+1}^0 + \cdots$, it follows that $R_q^\epsilon(z)H_q \to R_q^0(z)H_q^0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, and so we see that if $f_{q+1}^*\xi^* = 0$, then

$$\xi^*(\zeta) = \int_z \big(R_q^0(z)H_q^0 \wedge g_{N-q}\big)^* \wedge \xi^*(z) + f_q^*\tilde\xi^* = \Phi(\xi R_q^0)^* + f_q^*\tilde\xi^*,$$

where $\tilde\xi$ is an E_{q-1}^*-valued holomorphic p-form. Hence, Φ induces a left inverse of Ψ.

References

[1] Andersson, M. Coleff-Herrera currents, duality, and Noetherian operators. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* 139 (2011), no. 4, 535–554.

[2] Andersson, M. Uniqueness and factorization of Coleff-Herrera currents. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)* 18 (2009), no. 4, 651–661.

[3] Andersson, M. Integral representation with weights. II. Division and interpolation. *Math. Z.* 254 (2006), no. 2, 315–332.

[4] Andersson, M. Residues of holomorphic sections and Lelong currents. *Ark. Mat.* 43 (2005), no. 2, 201–219.

[5] Andersson, M. Integral representation with weights. I. *Math. Ann.* 326 (2003), no. 1, 1–18.

[6] Andersson, M.; Samuelsson, H. A Dolbeault-Grothendieck lemma on complex spaces via Koppelman formulas. *Invent. Math.* 190 (2012), no. 2, 261–297.

[7] Andersson, M.; Wulcan, E. Regularity of pseudomeromorphic currents. *arXiv:*1703.01247v2 [math.CV].

[8] Andersson, M.; Wulcan, E. Direct images of semi-meromorphic currents. *arXiv:*1411.4832v2 [math.CV].

[9] Andersson, M.; Wulcan, E. Decomposition of residue currents. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 638 (2010), 103–118.

[10] Andersson, M.; Wulcan, E. Residue currents with prescribed annihilator ideals. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* 40 (2007), no. 6, 985–1007.

[11] Björk, J.-E. Residues and $\mathscr{D}$-modules. *The legacy of Niels Henrik Abel*, 605–651, *Springer, Berlin,* 2004.
[12] Björk, J.-E. Analytic $\mathscr{D}$-modules and applications. Mathematics and its Applications, 247. *Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht*, 1993. xiv+581 pp.
[13] Coleff, N.; Herrera, M. Les courants résiduels associés à une forme méromorphe. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 633. *Springer, Berlin*, 1978. x+211 pp.
[14] Demailly, J.-P.; Passare, M. Courants résiduels et classe fondamentale. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 119 (1995), no. 1, 85–94.
[15] Dickenstein, A.; Sessa, C. Résidus de formes méromorphes et cohomologie modérée. *Géometrie complexe (Paris, 1992),* 35–59, Actualités Sci. Indust., 1438, *Hermann, Paris,* 1996.
[16] Dickenstein, A.; Sessa, C. Canonical representatives in moderate cohomology. *Invent. Math.* 80 (1985), no. 3, 417–434.
[17] Herrera, M.; Lieberman, D. Residues and principal values on complex spaces. *Math. Ann.* **194** (1971), 259–294.
[18] Hörmander, L. The analysis of linear partial differential operators. I. Distribution theory and Fourier analysis. Second edition. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenshaften, 256. *Springer-Verlag, Berlin*, 1990. xii+440 pp.
[19] Lärkäng, R; Samuelsson Kalm, H. Various approaches to products of residue currents. *J. Funct. Anal.* 264 (2013), no. 1, 118–138.
[20] Lärkäng, R; Wulcan, E. Residue currents and fundamental cycles. *arXiv:*1505.07289.
[21] Ruppenthal, J.; Samuelsson Kalm, H.; Wulcan, E. Explicit Serre duality on complex spaces. *Adv. Math.* 305 (2017), 1320–1355.
[22] Samuelsson Kalm, H. Holomorphic forms, the $\bar{\partial}$-equation, and duality on a reduced complex space. *arXiv:*1506.07842.

Håkan Samuelsson Kalm, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Division of Algebra and Geometry, University of Gothenburg and Chalmers University of Technology, SE-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden

E-mail address: hasam@chalmers.se